

# THE CASE OF THE BAPTISTS,

STATED AND EXPLAINED,

ADDRESSED TO ALL WHOM IT MAY CONCERN.

---

BY J. M. CRAMP, D. D.

---

"In every age, even the worst, there have been beneath the surface latent elements of religious life and of active goodness, which it will be our duty to bring to light, as the true signs of a better world beyond, and of the Divine Presence abiding with us even here.—a Church, as it were, within a Church; a 'remnant,' to use the language of the older covenant."

"Each age of the Church has, as it were, turned over a new leaf in the Bible, and found a response to its own wants. We have a leaf still to turn, a leaf not the less new because it is so old, not the less full of consequences because it is so simple."

DEAN STANLEY.

---

"CHRISTIAN MESSENGER" OFFICE,  
HALIFAX, N. S.  
1873.

THE CASE

OF THE

BAPTISTS

OF THE

IN THE

OF THE

THE

CHRISTIAN

WILLIAM

## THE CASE OF THE BAPTISTS.

---

We are sometimes told that the Baptists are a modern sect, never heard of till the sixteenth century, and that all their assertions about antiquity are unfounded; and some observations on a book of mine have been recently written by "A Clergyman," who, whatever may be his attainments in other respects, is grievously defective in Christian courtesy, not to say gentlemanly bearing, and to whom, therefore, I shall make no further reference.

But the question is—WHO ARE THE BAPTISTS?

If the inquiry relate to the *name*, the answer is, that it first began to be used when the principles and practices which it indicates were associated with a distinct and separate religious body, instead of being characteristic of Christendom, as at the first. So of other names. There were no Protestants till the sixteenth century, when the celebrated *Protest* of certain German states and princes at the Diet of Spire (A. D. 1529) originated Protestantism; whereas the truths comprised under that appellation have been held by Christians from the beginning, and in that sense Protestantism is as old as Christianity itself. Again:—Presbyterianism is traced to the same sixteenth century; but Presbyterians will tell us that their mode of church government was the original mode, and that the Church of Christ was Presbyterian from the first. It strikes me that they are almost right on that point—with some exceptions, however, not necessary to be now enumerated.

Take the church at Jerusalem, the church at Rome, and other churches, whose beginnings are recorded in the New Testament. What were they? They were societies of men and women, who professed "repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ," and who, when they made that profession, were baptized "into [Dean Alford's translation] the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," that is, "buried with Christ" in baptism, as all Christians were at that time. Those churches consisted of baptized believers, as Baptist churches do now. Christian history, in the first century, was strictly and properly Baptist history, although the word "Baptist," as a distinctive

appellation, was not then known. How could it be? How was it possible to call any Christians Baptist Christians, when all were Baptists?

We go further. Justin Martyr, writing about the middle of the second century, states how baptism was considered in his time. Thus he writes :—"As many as are persuaded and believe that what we teach and say is true, and undertake to be able to live accordingly, are instructed to pray and to entreat God with fasting, for the remission of sins that are past, we praying and fasting with them. Then they are brought by us where there is water, and are regenerated in the same manner in which we were ourselves regenerated. For, in the name of God, the Father and Lord of the universe, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, they then receive the washing with water. For Christ also said, 'Except ye be born again, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.'" Further on he says, "This washing is called illumination, because they who learn these things are illuminated in their understandings." (*First Apology*, Ch. 61.) Without stopping to criticise his use of the word "regenerated," which was not employed by him in its modern acceptation, I may say that it is evident that Justin Martyr was what *we* should call a Baptist, and that the Church at Rome, with which he was connected, maintained and practised our principles. It let them slip, however, before long.

Infant baptism and other additions to Christianity made their appearance in the third century. Men thought themselves at liberty to graft on the Christian profession usages which were unknown in apostolic days. They virtually surrendered the sole sufficiency of Scripture, and introduced human tradition as a new element in church affairs. Then commenced a conflict, which has continued from that time to the present. From age to age reformers have risen up bearing their testimony against church abuses, and endeavouring to restore the old Christianity. Some of them made specific reference to baptism; all pleaded for Christian character as necessary to church membership, and for the maintenance of the purity of the churches. The *Novatians* led the way, in the third century. I do not endorse all they said and did; but it is worth while to quote the remarks of one of our church historians (an *Episcopalian*). "He

[Novatian] considered the genuine Church of Christ to be a society where virtue and innocence reigned universally, and refused any longer to acknowledge those as its members who had even once degenerated into unrighteousness. His followers were called *Cathari*, or Puritans, and they comprehended many austere and independent Christians, in the east no less than in the west. But this endeavour to revive the spotless moral purity of the primitive faith was found inconsistent with the corruptions even of that early age; it was regarded with suspicion by the leading prelates, as a vain and visionary scheme; and those rigid principles, which had characterized and sanctified the Church in the first century, were abandoned to the profession of schismatic sectaries in the third." (Waddington's "History of the Church," i. 166). This is candid and liberal.

In the fourth century the *Donatists* raised the reform standard. They constituted about one-half of the Christian population of Northern Africa. Purity was their main object; they also, as well as the Novatians, called themselves *Cathari*—the *pure*—*Puritans*. Other men called them *Donatists*, after Donatus, whose leadership they followed. Robert Robinson, a learned writer of ecclesiastical history, in the last century, says they were "Trinitarian Baptists." The Rev. Thomas Long, Prebendary of Exeter, whose "History of the Donatists" was published in 1677, asserts that they "were generally anabaptistical; for they did not only rebaptize the adults that came over to them, but refused to baptize children, contrary to the practice of the Church, as appears by several discourses of St. Augustine," (Page 103).

That phrase, "the practice of the Church," is a very misleading one. The use of it arose in this way:—whatever ceremonies or usages existed, at any place or time, it was presumed, or represented, that it must have been always so from the beginning. The argument was—"This Church was founded in the times of the Apostles; such and such observances are now practised here; no doubt, therefore, that they were established by the Apostles." This was Augustine's argument for infant baptism. "If any one," he says, "seek for divine authority in this matter, though what is held by the whole Church, and that not as instituted by councils, but as a matter of *invariable custom*, is rightly



held to have been handed down by apostolical authority, still we can form a true conjecture of the value of the sacrament of baptism in the case of infants, from the parallel of circumcision"—and then he goes on to discuss *that* argument (*on Baptism*, Book iv. Chap. 24). Analysed, the argument stands thus:—"It exists; therefore, it is a custom:—it is a custom *now*; therefore, it must have been so from the beginning—and *therefore*, it is divine!" But we deny the fact. Infant baptism had not been "the invariable custom" of the Church. There was a time when it did not exist. "Baptism," says Neander, the great church historian, "was administered at first only to adults, as men were accustomed to conceive baptism and faith as strictly connected. We have all reason for not deriving infant baptism from apostolic institution, and the recognition of it which follows somewhat later as an apostolical tradition, serves to confirm this hypothesis, (Vol. i. p. 311, American Edition). Consequently, Augustine's conclusion falls to the ground.

The Romanists are adepts in the use of this argument. It serves their turn on all occasions. Thus, the Council of Trent instructs the children of the Church that "it is a good and useful thing suppliantly to invoke" the saints in heaven, and "to flee to their prayers, help and assistance;" and that "the images of Christ, of the Virgin Mother of God, and of other saints, are to be had and retained, especially in churches, and due honour and veneration rendered to them;"—and unblushingly asserts, in opposition to truth and history, that all this is "according to the practice of the catholic and apostolic church, received from the first beginning of the Christian religion" (Cramp's "Text-Book of Popery," p. 294—*Third Edition*). Protestants should take heed that they do not tread in the steps of the "Mother of abominations."

The opposition to traditional religion which distinguished the Donatists and others (among whom *Vigilantius* deserves honourable mention—he flourished in the fourth century, and Jerome poured coarse invectives on him, as was his wont) was continued through the succeeding centuries. God's witnesses—the Paulicians, and many more—testified for truth and holiness, and suffered for their testimony, by bonds, imprisonment, or death. Our knowledge of their tenets and practices is very imperfect, for this reason, that

the records were systematically destroyed. It was dangerous to suffer alleged heretics to get the ear of the public. In many cases, all we know is, that the parties accused denied baptism—generally meaning infant baptism—and sometimes the reasons of that denial are given. The Reformers maintained that faith is necessary to baptism, and that as infants cannot believe they ought not to be baptized. They protested also against the numberless appendages to worship which had been introduced, and the demands made on human credulity, and declared that they would have “the Bible, and the Bible only.” Baptists in all ages and everywhere have taken the same position. It is impregnable.

A large number of them were found among the Waldenses, scattered about on the hills and in the valleys of Piedmont, where they worshipped the Lord, it cannot be doubted, “in the beauty of holiness,” and edified one another, after the manner of primitive believers. Their doctrines, it is stated, “were remarkably identical with those of the apostolic times, and of the earliest fathers of the church. They may be summed up in these few words:—*The absolute authority and inspiration of the Bible—the Trinity in the Godhead—the sinful state of man—and free salvation by Jesus Christ—but above all, faith working by love*” (Muston’s *Israel of the Alps*, i. 20).

In the twelfth century there was a great revival in the South of France. It began under the ministry of Peter of Bruys, of whose previous history we have no authentic accounts. (The Editor of the *Church Chronicle* has made a discovery. He affirms that “the distinctive doctrine” of our denomination “never disturbed the faith of Christendom, until first preached by Peterall Brias, a Frenchman in the twelfth century.” Who “*Peterall Brias*” was neither he nor any one else can tell. Somebody has hoaxed him.)—He starts up all at once as an itinerant preacher, and appears to have been gifted with extraordinary eloquence, if we may judge from the effects of his preaching, as described by Roman Catholic writers. The people flocked by thousands to hear him, and those who received the truth were baptized, and formed into religious Societies, that is, into Baptist churches. This went on for twenty years. It was like a chapter in the Acts of the Apostles. “The word of God increased; and the number of the disciples multiplied in

Jerusalem greatly : and a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith." (Act. vi. 7).

He was followed by Henry of Lausanne, who had been a monk, and whose evangelical labours were as effective as those of Peter. The cities of Toulouse and Aby, and the district around them enjoyed his ministrations more than ten years. "The celebrated Bernard of Clairvaux says, in a letter to a nobleman, 'The churches are without flocks, the flocks without priests, the priests are nowhere treated with due reverence, the churches are levelled down to synagogues, the sacraments are not esteemed holy, the festivals are no longer celebrated'; and he states in one of his sermons that 'women forsake their husbands, and husbands their wives, and run over to this sect,' and that 'clergymen and priests desert their communities and churches.' Stripping these expressions of their Romish meaning, the facts of the case clearly show themselves. Had Henry been the historian he would have said. 'God has blessed his work; priests and people have received the gospel; true churches are now formed; Christian ordinances have supplanted the old superstitions; and the commands of Christ, and his only, are obeyed'" (Cramp's Baptist History, Chap. iv. Sect. 4).

Wall, the historian of Infant Baptism, styles these men "Anti-Pædobaptist preachers," and says that they were the "first" of the kind. That they were Baptist ministers, in our sense of the phrase, cannot be doubted; that they were the "first" of the kind will be denied by all impartial students of history.

Peter of Bruys died at the stake—murdered by a mob. Henry spent his last years in a church dungeon. Many a Baptist minister shared a like fate in the succeeding centuries, down to the seventeenth.

The South of France was reduced to a desert in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries by the hordes of the Inquisition, who wasted that fine country with fire and sword, because its inhabitants dared to think for themselves, and worship God as they believed he had commanded them. So terrible was the ruin that those who survived were driven into obscurity and hid themselves from the gaze of men, living in extreme want and peril. They were scattered over all Europe, and for many, many years were debarred the consolations of Christian fellowship, being



compelled to hold their meetings in secret, and to avoid recognition by their neighbors. The straits and miseries of that enforced seclusion cannot be described. The perpetual cry of the stricken was "How long, O Lord, how long?"—How many were murdered, how many were starved, will never be known on earth. But the register is preserved; it is correct and full; and one day "the books will be opened."

The Reformation in the sixteenth century broke up the hiding places, and the prisoners came forth. Speaking of the Mennonites, or German Baptists, Mosheim says—"Prior to the age of Luther, there lay concealed in almost every country of Europe, but especially in Bohemia, Moravia, Switzerland, and Germany, very many persons, in whose minds was deeply rooted that principle, which the Waldensians, the Wickliffites, and the Hussites maintained, some more covertly, and others more openly; namely that the kingdom which Christ set up on the earth, or the visible church, is an assembly of *holy* persons, and ought therefore to be entirely free, not only from ungodly persons and sinners, but from the institutions of human device against ungodliness. This principle lay at the foundation, and was the source of all that was new and singular in the religion of the Mennonites; and the greatest part of their singular opinions, as is well attested, were approved, some centuries before Luther's time, by those who had such views of the nature of the Church of Christ" (Church History, Cent. xvi. Sect. 3). Those were the views which had been held by the Baptists "some centuries before Luther's time," as has been shown in these pages. The Baptists, therefore, did not originate in the sixteenth century.

The first church of baptized believers was formed at Jerusalem, A. D. 31. Nearly thirty years afterwards the Apostle Paul said, "From Jerusalem, and round about unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ:"—"Thanks be unto God, who always causeth us to triumph in Christ, and maketh manifest the savour of his knowledge by us in every place" (Rom. xv. 19: 2 Cor. ii. 14.) The names of about thirty churches are found in the records of the New Testament; but those records are manifestly incomplete; we read of the churches in Achaia, Galatia, and other countries, but the names of none of them (Corinth

excepted) are preserved. We know, however, that the members of those churches had been "baptized into Christ," and "called upon his name:" and we rejoice in the belief that even in the darkest times of the subsequent history—those times in which, as Archbishop Leighton remarks, the Church could only be traced by her blood—could only be seen by the light of the fires in which her martyrs were burnt—the godly succession was kept up. There were gaps which cannot now be filled, and now and then the chain seemed to be broken. But it never was.

There was a "falling away." "Perilous times" came. Corruptions and abuses crept in. Idols were set up. Will worship prevailed. The word of God was neglected and trampled on. Priestcraft was rampant. Nevertheless, He "left not himself without witness." Every age brought to view champions for the true and right: and we Baptists are the Novatians, the Donatists, the Paulicians, the Petrobrusians of the nineteenth century.

Some one starts up in dismay;—"Sir! all those people were heretics and schismatics!" Hard words, these! But we have been used to them. They called our Lord himself a "Samaritan," and said that "he had a devil." The fact is, that the dominant party always assumed to be the orthodox, and bade the people believe that those who differed from them were heretics. Trinitarians were orthodox in the days of Constantine, and the Arians were banished. The Arians were the orthodox in the next reign, that of Constantius, and then the Trinitarians were banished. These alternations were continually taking place. And so it comes to this, that if you want to trace the true church of God, you must follow her down the line of those who have been stigmatized, and their names cast out as evil. Patriotism has been oftener found at the headsman's block than in kings' palaces.

"THE CHURCH"! What "great swelling words of vanity" have been employed on this subject! We hear every day of the teaching of "the Church," the laws of "the Church," and all people are commanded to do the bidding of "the Church." But what was that mysterious body called "the Church," in the times of her greatest glory, that is, during the ages of dulness and despotism—the times of Becket and Wolsey? Was she not "a cage of

unclean birds"—a conglomeration of all evils—a nest of vices? Had not public opinion declared against her for centuries, and demanded "reform, in the head and in the members"? Had not the true meaning of the word "Church" been lost for ages, so that it was understood to refer, not to the congregation of the members, in which sense our Lord used it (Mat. xviii. 17.), but to the prelates, particularly when assembled in Council? And now, the Greek Church declares itself to be the Church Catholic; the Roman Church makes the same averment; the Church of England, admitting that both these are branches of the Catholic Church, maintains that she also is a branch—with all her divisions and contrarieties—the "high"—the "low"—the "broad." Alas! alas! How unlike they all are to the mother church at Jerusalem!

"We are the priests of the Lord," they say. "We only are authorized to preach the word and administer the sacraments: ours is the true Apostolical Succession. We of the Church of England can trace the line of our bishops up to Augustine, in the sixth century, and from him to Peter." CAN YOU? One of you own archbishops will teach you a different lesson. "*There is not a minister in all Christendom,*" Archbishop Whately observes, "*who is able to trace up with any approach to certainty his own spiritual pedigree.*" His assertion is based on the following considerations:—"If a bishop has not been duly consecrated, or had not been, previously, rightly ordained, his ordinances are null; and so are the ministrations of those who are ordained by him; and their ordination of others; (supposing any of the persons ordained by him to attain to the episcopal office) and so on, without end. The poisonous taint of informality, if it once creep in undetected, will spread the infection of nullity to an indefinite and irremediable extent. \* \* And who can undertake to pronounce that during that long period usually designated as the Dark Ages, no such taint was ever introduced? Irregularities could not have been wholly excluded without a perpetual miracle; and that no such miraculous interference existed, we have even historical proof. Amidst the numerous corruptions of doctrine and of practice, and gross superstitions, that crept in, during those ages, we find recorded descriptions not only of the profound ignorance, and profligacy of life, of many of the clergy, but

also the grossest irregularities in respect of discipline and form. We read of Bishops consecrated when mere children—of men officiating who barely knew their letters;—of prelates expelled, and others put into their places, by violence;—of illiterate and profligate laymen, and habitual drunkards, admitted to holy orders; and in short, of the prevalence of every kind of disorder, and reckless disregard of the decency which the Apostle enjoins. It is inconceivable that any one even moderately acquainted with history, can feel a certainty, that, amidst all this confusion and corruption, every requisite form was in every instance, strictly adhered to, by men, many of them openly profane and secular, unrestrained by public opinion, through the gross ignorance of the population among which they lived; and that no one, not duly consecrated or ordained, was admitted to sacred offices." (*Essay on the Kingdom of Christ*, pp. 217—219).

As to the Apostle Peter, from whom the succession is said to be traced, as bishop of Rome, there is no satisfactory proof that he held that see. It is even denied by many learned men that he was ever at Rome at all. That position was maintained in a public discussion which took place in Rome itself, in February, 1872, between "Certain Catholic priests and Evangelical Ministers," a Report of which has been published.

But what is the "Apostolic Succession?" It is the succession of apostolic men—"faithful men, able to teach others also" (2 Tim. ii. 3)—ordained or unordained—gifted by Christ himself for the service.

The views on this subject, generally entertained by our Denomination, were thus expressed by the author, in an ordination sermon, preached at Montreal, in 1851:—

"By Apostolic Succession we understand a succession of apostolic men, holding and preaching apostolic truth, and leading apostolic lives. No others are in the succession, however regularly, as human laws and customs declare, they may have been ordained and appointed. We may suppose a case, not at all unlikely to occur in these days. During the same service the bishop lays his consecrating hands on two candidates for the ministry:—one of them goes forth, preaching full salvation by the death of Christ, and seeking

to promote evangelical holiness; the other connects the safety of the soul with baptism and the Church, substitutes the world's morality for the life of faith, and derides as fanatics those who plead for the new birth and for spiritual-mindedness. There is no difficulty in deciding that while the former is evidently in the succession, the latter is not—though both received the same appointment, from the same person, and at the same time. A man may be a minister of a church—of any church—who is not a minister of Christ, and will not be owned by him at the last day.

"That the succession has been maintained is proved by the existence of the Church. It could only have been perpetuated by the means and instruments which the Saviour at first appointed—by the ministry and manifestation of the truth. The fact, that there are at the present day servants of the Lord united together for Christian fellowship, holding the great truths of the gospel, and exemplifying its effects in holy lives and devoted zeal, will surely warrant the inference that in every age there have been such unions, on a greater or smaller scale, maintained by similar instrumentality. The chain of the spiritual succession has not been broken, though we may not be able to put our hands on every link. It ought not to be considered surprising that we cannot always discover the spiritual family. The Church was at one time in the wilderness; who can wonder that she was not then visible?

"In tracing the true succession we cannot adopt the ordinary course. We have no reverence for episcopal genealogies. The grace of Christ is not limited by ecclesiastical consecrations, with which, in thousands of instances, it has nothing to do. He 'divideth to every man severally as He will.' *We trace the succession therefore, in the spiritual line.* We see it in Novatian the dissenter, as well as in Cyprian the bishop;—in Vigilantius the reformer, as well as in Jerome who slandered him, and in Augustine, who, though he was a great and good man, would have committed alleged heretics to the civil power, to be punished;—in the Waldensian pedlar who carried his wares to the lordly castle and the peasant's hut, and exhorted all to buy the 'pearl of great price';—in John de Wycliffe, the canonically ordained Rector of Lutterworth, and in the Lollards who succeeded him, and who, though not canonic-



ally ordained, could tell of Christ, and grace, and heaven, and guide men to glory;—in John Huss and Jerome of Prague, both of them burned as heretics;—in Latimer and Ridley, consecrated bishops, and in Calvin and Knox, unconsecrated presbyters;—in Archbishop Leighton, the spiritually minded prelate, and in John Bunyan, the tinker of Elstow, the spiritually minded Baptist;—in Henry Martyn, that ‘holy man of God,’ the Episcopalian, and in John Williams, the martyr of the nineteenth century, the Congregationalist;—and finally we trace the succession in Daniel Wilson, the bishop, who preached at Calcutta, plainly and faithfully, the same gospel which he proclaimed in England’s metropolis—and in every native preacher and teacher, encouraged by Christian missionaries of various denominations to make known the great salvation to their fellow-countrymen—of every clime, of every tongue, and of all colours—white, yellow, copper, brown, or black—Hindoos, Indians, Chinese, Hottentots, or Negroes. ‘Washed, sanctified, and justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God,’ and found to be ‘faithful men, able to teach others also’—they are all in the succession.”

This, then, is *the case of the Baptists*. We claim to belong to the restorers of primitive Christianity. We aim to represent, as nearly as possible, the faith, the holiness, and the practice of the churches of the first age; for Christianity, like its Divine Founder, is “the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.” We profess to adopt for ourselves Chillingworth’s celebrated motto—“The Bible, the Bible only, is the Religion of Protestants.” Not that we pretend to perfection. Far from it. We know that there has been a tendency to declension all along, and that we, as well as other bodies of professing christians, are exposed to the danger; and we shall be thankful to any one who shall point out wherein we are mistaken, and show us “a more excellent way,” according to the Scriptures.

Let it be borne in mind, that in making these avowals, and in repeating them from time to time, we pronounce no sentence on brethren of other Denominations, who differ from us in the interpretation of Scripture, and who have as much right to differ from us as we have to differ from them. To their own Master they stand or fall. We have neither power nor inclination to curse men because they will not

subscribe our creed ; nor to declare that they shall "without doubt perish everlastingly" unless they believe as we do.\*

One word more. We are fully convinced that infant baptism has been the prolific source of evil, by filling the churches with unconverted members, and thus putting into the hands of infidels a powerful weapon against Christianity. And we heartily subscribe to the declaration of Balthazar Hubmeyer (martyred March 10th 1528)—"I believe and know, that Christendom shall not receive its rising aright, unless Baptism and the Lord's Supper are brought to their original purity."

#### CHRONOLOGICAL ITEMS.

##### A.D.

- 81 The Christian Church founded.
- 68 Martyrdom of Paul and Peter.
- 251 The Novatians.
- 311 The Donatists.
- 325 The Council of Nice.
- 596 Mission of Augustine the Monk to England.
- 650 The Paulicians.
- 1122 Peter of Bruys put to death.
- 1155 Arnold of Brescia burned.
- 1209 Crusade against the Albigenses.
- 1229 Rise of the Inquisition.
- 1384 Death of John de Wycliffe.
- 1517 Commencement of the Reformation.
- 1559 Rise of the Puritans in England.
- 1572 Massacre of the Protestants in France.
- 1580 Rise of the Brownists.
- 1620 Settlement of the Puritans in New England.
- 1649 Rise of the Quakers.
- 1662 Act of Uniformity, England.
- 1674 Death of John Milton, Nov. 8.
- 1698 Death of John Bunyan, Aug. 30.
- 1739 Methodist Societies formed.

---

\**Anecdote of King George III.* The following Windsor anecdote was told me by the late Dr. Heberden: The clergyman there, on a day when the Athanasian Creed was to be read, began with, Whosoever will be saved, &c.; the King, who usually responded with a loud voice, was silent: the minister repeated, in a higher tone, his 'Whosoever'; the king continued silent:—at length, the Apostles Creed was repeated by the minister, and the King followed him throughout, with a distinct and audible voice." *Life of Bishop Watson*, i. 195.

- 1764 Brown University founded.
- 1792 Baptist Missionary Society founded.
- 1799 Religious Tract Society founded.
- 1800 Church Missionary Society founded.
- 1804 British and Foreign Bible Society founded.
- 1815 Death of Andrew Fuller, May 7.
- 1831 Death of Robert Hall, Feb. 21.
- 1833 Rise of the Tractarians.
- 1834 Death of Dr. Carey, June 9.
- 1839 Williams the Missionary murdered, Nov. 20.
- 1850 Death of Dr. Judson, April 12.

### Baptist Statistics.

There are in Great Britain and Ireland 2639 Baptist Churches, containing 241,764 Members.

In Ontario and Quebec there are 322 Churches, with 17,042 Members.

In Nova Scotia [there are 163 Churches, with 18,046 Members.

In New Brunswick, 134 Churches, 10,133 Members.

In Prince Edward Island, 14 Churches, 920 Members.

In Jamaica, 101 Churches, 20,412 Members.

In Australasia, 141 Churches, with upwards of 6000 Members.

In the United States, there are 19,720 Churches, containing 1,585,232 Members.

There are 17 Churches in Denmark, 220 in Sweden, 73 in Germany.

In Asia, there are 408 Mission Churches, with 26,814 Members.

In Africa, there 31 Mission Churches, with 1930 Members.

The Sunday School Statistics are not complete. As far as reported, there are in the United States 9412 Sunday Schools containing 653,742 Scholars, and upwards of 700,000 volumes in their Libraries.

There are also in the United States 34 Colleges and Universities, connected with the Baptist Denomination, and nine Theological Institutions. The Colleges have 140,000 volumes in their Libraries; the Theological Institutions, 60,000.